

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02309 01 OF 02 262249Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-04

RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-20

NSC-07 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 IO-14 OIC-04 DRC-01

SAM-01 MC-02 /151 W

----- 081141

R 261930Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5403

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2309

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION APRIL 25 OF ISSUES RELATED TO LINK
BETWEEN PHASES

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: (A) USNATO 2268; (B) USNATO 2165; (C) USNATO 1863 (NOTAL)

1. SUMMARY OF APRIL 25 SPC DISCUSSION ON LINKAGE ISSUES TRANSMITTED SEPARATELY AS REF A. THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES FURTHER DETAILS ON MEETING.

2. NON-INCREASE OF FORCES COMMITMENT. SPC ON APRIL 25 TOOK FIRST LOOK AT IS DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AD HOC GROUP ON NON-INCREASE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02309 01 OF 02 262249Z

OF FORCES COMMITMENT (REF B). PARAGRAPH REFERENCES IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ARE TO SECTION III OF REFTL.

3. PARA A. NETHERLANDS, UK AND BELGIUM HAD PROBLEM WITH

REFERENCE TO NOT INCREASING "ABOVE A BASE FIGURE" WHICH IMPLIED SOME AGREEMENT ON DATA BASE, WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT BE NECESSARY. UK PROPOSED DROPPING "ABOVE A BASE FIGURE" AS WELL AS SECOND SENTENCE. CANADA THOUGHT IT NECESSARY TO ADMIT HERE THAT ANY NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT WOULD HAVE TO INCLUDE BASE FIGURES. CHAIRMAN (KESTL) THOUGHT IT DEPENDED ON FORM OF AGREEMENT: AN EXCHNGE OF DECLARATIONS NOT TO INCREASE ABOVE PRESENT LEVELS MIGHT NOT REQUIRE AGREED BASE FIGURES. IS PROPOSED LANGUAGE "ABOVE A BASE FIGURE", ADDITING TO END OF FIRST SENTENCE "AFTER FIRST PHASE WITHDRAWALS" AND DROPPING SECOND SENTENCE.

4. UK SUGGESTED DROPPING FIRST BRACKETS IN PARA A, SO AS TO LIMIT NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT TO GROUND FORCE MANPOWER ONLY. NETHERLANDS SAID WE KNOW SOVIET UNION WILL NOT ACCEPT NON-INCREASE LIMITED TO GROUND MANPOWER ONLY, SO WHY NOT GIVE AHG ENOUGH MATERIAL SO IT WILL NOT HAVE TO COME RIGHT BACK TO NATO FOR MORE GUIDANCE. HE SPECIFICALLY REFERRED TO POSSIBLE NEED TO INTRODUCE AIR FORCE MANPOWER. U.S. REP SUGGESTED THAT BASIC DECISION ON AIR FORCE MANPOWER SHOULD BE MADE IN CONTEXT OF FIRST STAGE AGREEMENT AND THAT NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT COULD IN THAT RESPECT POSSIBLY PARALLEL ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN FIRST PHASE. UK THOUGHT SPC WOULD PURSUE AIR FORCE QUESTION SEPARATELY, SINCE THIS COMES UP IN A SEPARATE ITEM IN AHG REQUEST. (COMMENT: DUTCH REP TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT A HIGH-LEVEL MEETING IN THE HAGUE NEXT WEEK WILL CONSIDER THIS QUESTION. IN MEANTIME, HE WILL HAVE TO MAINTAIN BRACKETS AROUND "GROUND FORCE". END COMMENT)

5. UK POINTED OUT THAT IN WANTING SECOND BRACKETS IN PARA A, AROUND "NO EQUIPMENT OF ANY KIND WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT," UK WAS ONLY SEEKING TO PERMIT INCLUSION OF SOVIET TANKS IN NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT, ASSUMING THESE ARE INCLUDED IN PHASE I AGREEMENT AND TO PREVENT THEIR BEING TRANSFERRED TO OTHER WP COUNTRIES. BELGIUM AND NETHERLANDS AGREED THAT SOVIET TANKS DIFFERED FROM OTHER KINDS OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT. GERMANY SECONDED BY U.S., URGED DROPPING BOTH FIRST AND SECOND BRACKETS UK PROPOSED THE FOLLOWING IN THE PLACE OF SECOND BRACKET: "THE ALLIED AIM WOULD BE TO AVOID SPECIFYING EQUIPMENT ON SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02309 01 OF 02 262249Z

ALLIED SIDE, BUT IF FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT REFERRED TO EQUIPMENT (E.G. SOVIET TANKS) THE NON INCREASE AGREEMENT WOULD PROBABLY HAVE TO FOLLOW SUIT." (COMMENT: SUBSEQUENT TO MEETING, WE TRIED TO DISSUADE UK REP FROM PURSUING THIS FORMULA. WE POINTED OUT THAT INTRODUCING EQUIPMENT CEILINGS--FACTOR GREATLY COMPLICATED NON-INCREASE QUESTION, WOULD REPRESENT A MAJOR CONCESSION TO SOVIETS, AND WOULD INTERFERE WITH ALLIED FORCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. WE ALSO NOTED THAT IF IT BECAME NECESSARY TO PROHIBIT TRANSFER OF REDUCED SOVIET TANKS TO THER WP COUNTRIES, ALLIES COULD CONSIDER A NON-TRANSFER CLAUSE IN REDUCTIONS AGREEMENT ITSELF. UK REP RESPONDED THAT ALL HE WANTED TO DO WAS POSE ISSUE AND DID NOT FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT HIS FORMULATION. AT NEXT SPC MEETING, MISSION PLANS TO PRESS EITHER FOR FORMULATION ALONG

LINES OF ORIGINAL SENTENCE IN DRAFT ON EQUIPMENT OR FOR
DROPPING ANY REFERENCE TO EQUIPMENT WHATSOEVER. END COMMENT.)

6. PARA B. BELGIUM RECOMMENDED DELETION OF PHRASE "ON THE
REDUCTION OF U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES" IN FIRST SENTENCE ON
GROUNDS OTHER THINGS ARE INVOLVED IN PHASE I AS WELL. HE ALSO
FAVORED DROPPING BRACKETED LANGUAGE IN REST OF PARA ON GROUNDS
NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT NOT A QUID TO OBTAIN A QUO, BUT A
COMPLETION OF THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL IN C-M(73)83 WITH ALL ITS
VARIOUS ELEMENTS, NOT JUST THE COMMON CEILING, TO MAKE IT MORE
ACCEPTABLE TO WP. GERMANY COULD AGREE TO THE DELETION IN FIRST
SENTENCE, BUT NOT THE REST, SINCE FRG AUTHORITIES HAD STRONGLY
EMPHASIZED COMMON CEILING AS CONDITION FOR NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT.
CANADA QUESTIONED BELGIAN REMARK THAT NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT NOT
A QUID PRO QUO, SINCE NON INCREASE WOULD GIVE WP SOMETHING
IT WANTS. CANADA THEREFORE WANTED TO KEEP AT LEAST THE FIRST PART
OF THE SECOND BRACKETED SENTENCE. NETHERLANDS REP SAID HIS
AUTHORITIES ALSO SINGLED OUT COMMON CEILING, BUT HE WOULD RECOMMEND
THE BELGIAN REASONING TO THEM. UK SUGGESTED ADDITION TO FIRST
SENTENCE OF "INCLUDING THE COMMON CEILING," AND DROPPING OF
BRACKETED LANGUAGE. FRG REP INDICATED HE WOULD RECOMMEND THIS
VERSION TO BONN.

7. PARA C. CHAIRMAN SUGGESTED, AND NO ONE OBJECTED, THAT
THE THIRD SENTENCE BEGIN "THE NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT COULD ASSUME
SEVERAL FORMS, E.G.", AND THEN DROP THE BRACKETS SO AS TO
INDICATE THREE ILLUSTRATIVE POSSIBILITIES RE FORM OF AGREEMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 02309 01 OF 02 262249Z

8. PARA D. NO OBJECTIONS.

9. PARA E. NETHERLANDS SUGGESTED "E.G." BE INSERTED BEFORE
"TWO YEARS" AS LIMITATION OF PERIOD OF NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT,
WITH BRACKETS DROPPED.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 02309 02 OF 02 262303Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 PA-04

RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-20

NSC-07 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 IO-14 OIC-04 DRC-01

SAM-01 MC-02 /151 W

----- 081382

R 261930Z APR 74

FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5404
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY LUXEMBOURG
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2309

10. PARA F. UK ASKED MEANING OF LAST CLAUSE, AND IS REPLIED
THAT THE TECHNICAL STUDY REFERRED TO WOULD BE UNDERTAKEN WHEN
NATO AND WP REACHED AGREEING PHASE.

11. PARA G. UK THOUGHT INTRODUCTION TO PAPER SHOULD
INCLUDE STATEMENT ON WHO WOULD MAKE THE COMMITMENT, E.G.: "THE
PARTIES TO THE NON-INCREASE AGREEMENT, REGARDLESS OF THE FORM
IT MIGHT TAKE, WOULD BE ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ON BOTH SIDES."

12. PARA ON ADVANTAGES. BELGINA REP SAID THAT SINCE THIS
IS DRAFT GUIDANCE FOR AHG, THIS SECTION UNNECESSARY. CHAIRMAN
AGREED AND SAID IT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN COVER NOTE. IS WILL
CIRCULATE REVISED DRAFT OF TEXT ON NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT FOR
CONSIDERATION OF SPC IN TUESDAY, APRIL 30.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02309 02 OF 02 262303Z

13. FIXED PERIOD OF TIME. SPC HAD INITIAL EXCHANGE OF VIES ON
THIS SUBJECT BELGIAN REP ON BASIS OF "GENERAL" INSTRUCTIONS
THOUGH WEST NEEDED ONLY A PARTIAL COMPLETION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS
BEFORE COMMENCING PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. IN SETTLING A PERIOD OF
TIME TO ELAPSE BETWEEN PHASES, PERIOD MUST BEGIN NOT WITH RATIFICATION

OF PHASE I BUT WITH ENTRY INTO FORCE, TO PREVENT OTHER SIDE FROM
DELAYING RATIFICATION IN ORDER TO DELAY TROOP CUTS. NATO COUNTRIES
SHOULD NOT CONCLUDE PHASE II AGREEMENT UNTIL PHASE I FULLY
IMPLEMENTED. NETHERLANDS REP, BASED ON "OLD INSTRUCTIONS", AGREED
WITH BELGIUM THAT PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD BEGIN SOME TIME
AFTER PHASE I REDUCTION HAD BEGUN. HE STRESSED THAT WESTERN PUBLIC
OPINION WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND DELAYING OF BEGINNING OF PHASE II
NEGOTIATIONS UNTIL PHASE I REDUCTIONS AND VERIFICATION FULLY
IMPLEMENTED. HE AGREED ALSO WITH BELGIUM THAT PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS
SHOULD NOT CONCLUDE UNTIL PHASE I FULLY CARRIED OUT. HE COMPLI-
MENTED MBFR WG REPORT ON TIME REQUIRED TO COMPLETE AND VERIFY
WITHDRAWALS AS PROVIDING USEFUL ELEMENTS ON TIMING OF IMPLEMENTATION,
ALTHOUGH DECISION ON TIME BETWEEN PHASES WILL ULTIMATELY BE
POLITICAL.

14. UK REP'S PRELIMINARY THOUGHT WAS THAT PHASE I WITHDRAWALS SHOULD BE COMPLETED BEFORE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS BEGIN, ALTHOUGH PHASE II NEGOTIATION WOULD NOT HAVE TO AWAIT VERIFICATION AND RELOCATION OF WITHDRAWN FORCES. WG PAPER SHOWS DIFFICULTY IN DETERMINING THE TIME REQUIRED FOR WITHDRAWALS. EVERYTHING BEGINS WITH PLANNING OF WITHDRAWALS, AND WE DO NOT KNOW WHEN SOVIETS WILL BEGIN PLANNING. TO GET A STATED PERIOD OF TIME BETWEEN PHASES IN PHASE I AGREEMENT, WHY NOT ASK SOVIETS TO SUGGEST A TIME, BASED ON TIME THEY WOULD REQUIRE TO WITHDRAW.

15. GERMAN REP PERSONALLY THOUGHT, LIKE UK REP, THAT WEST NEEDED TO MAKE BEGINNING OF PHASE II CONTINGENT ON COMPLETION OF SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS. GERMAN REP THOUGHT THAT GIVEN SOVIET INTEREST IN VERY EARLY PHASE II, SOVIETS WOULD HASTEN PHASE I WITHDRAWALS TO GET WEST TO THE TABLE. ALSO LIKE UK REP, HE DIDNOT THINK IT NECESSARY THAT ALL ASPECTS OF PHASE I, E.G. VERIFICATION, BE IMPLEMENTED PRIOR TO BEGINNING OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. NETHERLANDS REP DISAGREED TO SOME EXTENT WITH UK AND FRG STATEMENTS. IF THE WEST BEGAN PHASE II NEGOTIATION PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS SOVIETS WOULD STILL KNOW THAT THERE WOULD BE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02309 02 OF 02 262303Z

NO PHASE II AGREEMENT WITHOUT COMPLETE SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS. BELGIAN REP ALSO STRESSED THAT SOVIETS WOULD PROPAGANDIZE THAT WEST WAS SUPER-CAUTIOUS IF WE INSISTED ON COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS BEFORE STARTING PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. ON THE BASIS OF DISCUSSION IS WILL NOW DRAFT NAC GUIDANCE TO AD HOC GROUP ON FIXED PERIOD OF TIME, FOR CONSIDERATION BY SPC NEXT WEEK.

16. ASSESSMENT OF SECOND PHASE. BELGIAN REP POINTED OUT NO COUNTRY COULD PROVIDE ASSURANCE IT WOULD PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS UNDER SECOND PHASE AGREEMENT REGARDLESS OF ITS TERMS. NO ONE IS WILLING TO GIVE THE SOVIETS SUCH A BLANK CHECK. GERMAN REP ON PERSONAL BASIS THOUGHT EACH NATO COUNTRY COULD ONLY DECLARE IT IS COMMITTED TO SECOND PHASE NEGOTIATIONS, AND THAT AS PART OF ACCEPTABLE AGREEMENT, INCLUDING COMMON CEILING, IT WOULD BE WILLINT TO PARTICIPATE IN REDUCTIONS. LUXEMBOURG REP REMINDED SPC THAT LUXEMBOURG WAS IN NO POSITIMN TO REDUCE ITS ARMED FORCES FURTHER, AND THAT THIS APPEARS GENERALLY RECOGNIZED BOTH IN NATO AND BY THE WARSAW PACT. BELGIAN REP OBSERVED THAT THE U.S. HAD NEVER STATED DEFINITELY THAT ITS OWN FORCES WOULD BE INCLUDED IN SECOND PHASE REDUCTIONS. AFTER FURTHER SPC DISCUSSION IS WILL DRAFT NAC GUIDANCE TO AHG ON SECOND PHASE ASSURANCES. MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 26 APR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO02309
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740482/abbryupa.tel
Line Count: 264
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 2268; (B) USNATO 2165; (C) USNATO 1863 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 MAY 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <20-Jul-2001 by reddocgw, RDFRD>; RELEASED <07 MAY 2002 by golinofr>; APPROVED <07 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION APRIL 25 OF ISSUES RELATED TO LINK BETWEEN PHASES
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
BRUSSELS
THE HAGUE
LONDON
LUXEMBOURG

OTTAWA
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005